PATENT COOPERATION TREA

PCT

-	REC'D	0 3	JAN	2006
	WIPO			PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file re	foronce	·						
41575-373	FOR FURTHER A	ACTION	See Form PCT/IPEA/416					
International application No PCT/US2005/002298	. International filing date 25.01.2005	e (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 06.02.2004					
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC F16H1/28								
Applicant L & P PROPERTY MANAGEMENT COMPANY et al.								
 This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36. 								
2. This REPORT cons	sists of a total of 9 sheets, including	this cover sheet.						
3. This report is also	accompanied by ANNEXES, compris	sing:						
a. \square sent to the a	applicant and to the International Bui	<i>eau)</i> a total of sheets, a	s follows:					
and/or s	sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).							
beyond	party.							
seguence lis								
This report contains indications relating to the following items:								
☐ Box No. I B	Basis of the opinion							
_	Priority							
☐ Box No. III N	lon-establishment of opinion with reg	ard to novelty, inventive	step and industrial applicability					
	ack of unity of invention	•						
⊠ Box No. V F a	·							
🖾 Box No. VI C	Certain documents cited							
🖾 Box No. VII C	ertain defects in the international ap	plication						
☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application								
Date of submission of the de	emand	Date of completion of this	s report					
11.11.2005		29.12.2005						
Name and mailing address of		Authorized Officer	ines Palanten					
preliminary examining author European Pat D-80298 Mun Tel. +49 89 23 Fax: +49 89 2	tent Office ich 399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d	Meyer, T Telephone No. +49 89 23	The state of the s					
		1	* Ollice outon					

International application No. PCT/US2005/002298

_	Box No. I Basis of the repor	rt					
1.	 With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language in which it visited, unless otherwise indicated under this item. 						
	which is the language of a international search (un publication of the internation	nslations from the original language into the following language, translation furnished for the purposes of: der Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)) ational application (under Rule 12.4) v examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)					
2.	. With regard to the elements* or have been furnished to the receins report as "originally filed" and a	f the international application, this report is based on (replacement sheets reviving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in the referred to in the not annexed to this report):	which this				
	Description, Pages						
	1-14	as originally filed					
	Claims, Numbers		t				
	1-11	as originally filed					
	Drawings, Sheets						
	1/6-6/6	received on 25.04.2005 with letter of 17.03.2005					
	☐ a sequence listing and/or ar	ny related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing					
3.	☐ The amendments have rest	ulted in the cancellation of:					
	☐ the description, pages☐ the claims, Nos.☐						
	☐ the drawings, sheets/figs☐ the sequence listing (spe	ecify):					
	any table(s) related to se	equence listing (specify):					
4.	☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).						
	☐ the description, pages☐ the claims, Nos.						
	☐ the drawings, sheets/figs☐ the sequence listing <i>(spe</i>						
	☐ any table(s) related to se						
	* If item 4 applies, so	ome or all of these sheets may be marked "superseded."					

International application No. PCT/US2005/002298

	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
1.	The obv	ne questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non- ovious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:			
		the entire international application,			
	\boxtimes	claims Nos. 5-11			
		because:			
		the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):			
		the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):			
		the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.			
		no international search report has been established for the said claims Nos. 5-11			
		the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:			
		the written form		has not been furnished	
				does not comply with the standard	
		the computer readable form		has not been furnished	
				does not comply with the standard	
		the tables related to the nucleot not comply with the technical re	ide a quire	and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do ements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.	
		See separate sheet for further of	letai	ds .	

r 1 "

International application No. PCT/US2005/002298

	Box	No. IV	Lack of unity of inve	ention		
1.	 In response to the invitation to restrict or pay additional fees, the applicant has: □ restricted the claims. □ paid additional fees. □ paid additional fees under protest. ☑ neither restricted nor paid additional fees. 					
2.		☐ This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose, according to Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees.				
This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and is			of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3.			
		complied	d with.			
□ not complied with for the following reasons:						
see separate sheet						
4.	. Consequently, this report has been established in respect of the following parts of the international application				pect of the following parts of the international application:	
	□ all parts.					
		the parts	relating to claims No	s. 1-4		
	Bo	x No. V olicability	Reasoned statemer; citations and expla	nt und mation	er Article 35 ns supportir	(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial ng such statement
1.	Sta	tement				
		Novelty (N)		Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-5
		entive ste	p (IS)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-5
	Ind	ustrial ap	olicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-5
2.	Cita	ations and	d explanations (Rule 7	0.7):		

see separate sheet

International application No. PCT/US2005/002298

Box No. VI Certain documents cited

Certain published documents (Rule 70.10)
 and / or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rule 70.9)

see separate sheet

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

State of the Art:

During the procedure, reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: DE 44 12 898 A1 (ORLOWSKI, BERNHARD, DIPL.-ING., 70176 STUTTGART, DE) 19 October 1995 (1995-10-19)
- D2: DE 103 14 771 A1 (ROBERT BOSCH GMBH) 14 October 2004 (2004-10-14)
- D3: US-A-4 918 344 (CHIKAMORI ET AL) 17 April 1990 (1990-04-17)
- D4: US-A-4 050 331 (BRAREN ET AL) 27 September 1977 (1977-09-27)
- D5: WO 01/48397 A (DIRO GMBH & CO. KG; TOMCZYK, HUBERT) 5 July 2001 (2001-07-05)
- D6: DE 299 05 163 U1 (ASEC GMBH, 51702 BERGNEUSTADT, DE) 1 July 1999 (1999-07-01)
- D7: US-A-5 429 558 (LAGARDE ET AL) 4 July 1995 (1995-07-04)

Regarding D3, see "ad Re VI." below.

Ad Re IV.:

- 1. The application relates to a plurality of inventions or groups of inventions, in the sense of Rule 13.1 PCT, in particular the claims form three separate groups of subject-matter/inventions:
- 1.1. Claims 1 to 5 relating to a hollow axle motor assembly comprising substantially an electric motor and a hollow axle, wherein said axle drives a planetary gearing which drives an inner output shaft.
- 1.2. Claims 6 to 10 relating to a track dive mechanism comprising inter alia a hollow axle motor assembly comprising substantially an electric motor and a hollow axle, wherein said axle drives two tracks and a housing of the electric motor drives unlocking mechanisms for said tracks.
- 1.3. Claim 11 relating substantially a seat bottom, a seat back and an a hollow axle motor assembly comprising substantially an electric motor, a hollow axle and a housing,

wherein the axle drives the seat bottom, said housing drives said seat back.

1.4. The common among claims 1, 6 and 11 is thus substantially represented by the features

"a hollow axle motor assembly comprising substantially an electric motor and a hollow axle".

Said concept is however not novel, see for example document **D3** or **D1** (see § ad re V. below).

1.5. If the applicant pays additional fees for the two not yet searched groups of inventions, then the further searches may reveal further prior art that gives evidence of a further lack of unity 'a posteriori' within the not yet searched groups. In such a case only the first invention in these groups of inventions, which is considered to lack unity of invention, will be the subject of a search. No further invitation to pay further additional fees will be issued. This is because Article 17(3)(a) PCT stipulates that the ISA shall establish the International Search Report on those parts of the international application which relate to the invention first mentioned in the claims ('main invention') and for those parts which relate to inventions in respect of which the additional fees were paid. Neither the PCT nor the PCT guidelines provide a legal basis for further invitations to pay further additional search fees (W17/00, point 11 and W1/97, points 11-16).

Ad Re Item V.:

1. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant prior art, discloses in the embodiment of Fig. 3

a hollow axle motor assembly comprising substantially

- electric motor 3, 4
- hollow shaft 27
- first gear 28
- planetary gear drive assembly 20, 21, 28

PCT/US2005/002298

- drive shaft 26
- drive shaft mount 26, 21.

Thus the present wording of claim 1 is so broad, that D1 completely covers its scope.

- 2. Important note regarding inventive step (Art. 33(1) PCT):
- 2.1. The assembly of D3 differs from the assembly of claim 1 only in that rollers instead of "gears" are used. However it would be per se obvious to the skilled person to replace the rollers of D3 by common gears while maintaining the general structure.
- 2.2 It is noted that the very general idea to use a hollow ring gear of a planetary gear stage as input is of course already known, see for example D4, column 6, lines 14ff.
 - Thus in particular D3 and D4 must be taken into consideration regarding inventive step in any future procedural step.
- 3. The dependent claims 2 to 4 define very general details which are also known by at least D1. See for example items 1 and 2 of D1 for the "cover" of claim 3, or see the "Aggregat" according to column 3, line 5 of D1 for claim 4. The diameter of shaft 26 is of course smaller than that of shaft 27, cf. claim 5 of the application.

Ad Re VI.:

1. The document D2 indicated in the search report as a P-document is not to be regarded as state of the art, as the date of priority claimed can be allowed for the relevant parts of the present application.

Ad Re VII.:

1. It is at present not apparent which part of the application could serve as a basis for a new, allowable claim. Should the applicant nevertheless regard some particular matter as patentable an independent claim including such matter should be filed. The applicant should also indicate in the letter of reply the difference of the subject-matter of the new claim vis-à-vis the state of the art and the significance thereof.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

PCT/US2005/002298

- 2. To meet the requirements of Rule 6.3(b) PCT the independent claim should be properly cast in the two part form, with those features which in combination are part of the prior art (see document D1) being placed in the preamble.
 - D1 should be identified as the document disclosing the features according to the preamble of independent claim 1.
- 3. The description must be brought into conformity with any fresh claims (Rule 5.1. a) PCT). Particular care must be taken that if all statements relating to embodiments which will be no longer included in the claims are deleted.
- 4. Particular care should however be taken during revision of the whole application, and especially of the introductory portion of the description including any statements of problem or advantage, not to add subject-matter which extends beyond the content of the application as originally filed.
 - In order to facilitate the examination of the conformity of the amended application the applicant is requested to clearly identify the amendments carried out, irrespective of whether they concern amendments by addition, replacement or deletion, and to indicate the passages of the original application as filed on which these amendments are based (Art. 34(2)b) PCT).
 - In view of procedural transparency and efficiency these indications could be submitted in handwritten form on an additional copy at least of the relevant parts of the application as filed (for illustration of the principle cf. "a means—spring, "a means spring" or "a spring"). If handwritten amendments only are submitted, they should be clearly legible for the printer.
- 5. In addition to written communications, during the entire examination procedure the examiner is prepared to deal with matters (which are not too extensive) by telephone, cf. the telephone number on the cover sheet of this communication.